

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant City of Redwood City

Amount Requested

\$8,000,000

Proposal Title

Bayfront Regional Flood Protection
System Improvements and 5th Avenue
Pump Station Renovation Project

Total Proposal Cost

\$16,000,000

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The project consists of two components: 1) upsizing the 5th Avenue pump station and 2) infrastructure improvements to the regional drainage system along the city side of the Bayfront Canal and portions of the Atherton Channel. Upsizing the pump station will address seismic safety issues and handle more storm events. The infrastructure improvements will consist of sheet pile floodwalls that will be constructed to hold back stormwater and high-tides from flooding developed land areas.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	6/12
Budget	3/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/12
Schedule	3/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			36

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The Work Plan states that the construction drawings for the 5th Avenue Pump Station are included in the application; however, could not be located by the reviewer either in the application hardcopy or the CD. Designs for installation of sheet piling (Component 2 of the Project) have not yet begun. The Work Plan does not identify the necessary permits for component 2, and the status of securing such permits is not discussed. The Work Plan only discusses briefly CEQA status of the Project. The Work Plan does not address if permits are needed for Component 1; and only states that needed permits will be obtained for Component 2. The Proposal includes a listing of scientific and technical information that support the feasibility of the Project and provides studies and technical documents on the CD.

Budget

The Proposal Budget has detailed cost information, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories. A budget summary and task budgets are provided. The Budget and labor cost, as well as detailed back up, is provided for the Construction Task. The Budget states that other task costs are based on prior experience or similar projects the City has constructed and no further back up is provided. The Budget and labor costs, for the Construction Task. However, the detailed back up provided on CD, contains mostly “Lump Sum Estimates” and does not provide backup documentation such as hourly wages and number of hours, per discipline. Additionally, the Construction Task in the Work Plan depicts three subtasks, while the Construction Task in the Budget depicts no subtasks.

Schedule

The Schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable or demonstrates a readiness to begin construction or implementation between six and 12 months after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011). Notice to Proceed for Component 1 and 2 are scheduled for June 2012 and January 2015, respectively. However, the Schedule is missing a Task 7 and thus is not numbered consistently with the Work Plan or Budget. The Schedule does not include Construction sub-tasks depicted in the Work Plan. Quarterly and final report milestones are indicated.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete and insufficient. The attachment does not present the planned project monitoring, assessment, and performance measures that demonstrate the Proposal will meet its intended goal. Output indicators do not effectively track the output. For example, the Project Goals “Protect Public Health” and Safety” and Improve Water Quality” include, in part, the Desired Outcomes of “reduced occurrences of sanitary system overflow”: however, do not include Output Indicators or Targets to track changes. Most of the measurements and indicators are qualitative and are not clearly explained. Some measurement tools are not clearly defined and are not reasonable. For example, “visual observations” is listed as a measurement tool for the “water quality improvement” goal. The Proposal is consistent with the Basin Plan.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Average levels of flood damage reduction and water supply benefits can be realized through this Proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. In particular, 1) the number of structures flooded may not be proportionate to flow as assumed, 2) there were only 2 events included; and, 3) the damages per structure are not related to depth. \$33,000 and \$10,600 worth of damage are assumed for commercial and residential structure respectively. Total Net Present Value of costs is \$12.716 million. FDR benefits are \$14.218 million, more than costs. No water supply benefits are claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of water quality and other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis was partially lacking and/or supporting documentation was partially unsubstantiated. Water quality and other claimed monetized benefits are \$1.518 million. Monetized water quality and other benefits claims include avoidance of debris clean-up costs and public safety costs. They are assumed to occur every other year. The attachment claims benefits for reduced potential for sewer overflows and reduced sediment loading into San Francisco Bay; these are potentially significant and should have been quantified.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Climate Change Response Actions, Practice Integrated Flood Management and Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.